



# **Optionality in Assessment: Case Studies**

## Case Study 5

Author: Susan Laura Ramsdale

Institution: University of Manchester

Discipline/Field of Study: Nursing

Type of Assessment: Students choose their own assessment format

Credits: 10

Level: Level 5

Unit Type: Mandatory or core for all students on a particular programme

**Type of Optionality:** Submission format and able to choose own topic, but both must be agreed with supervisor

## Assessment Details:

The Negotiated study unit forms part of the pre-registration nursing degree and is part of a suite of 10 credit optional units in year 2. It gives students the opportunity to explore topics that might not be encountered through the degree pathway and to also try novel submission formats.

### a. Instructions for completing the assessment

#### Choosing a topic and format for submission:

- You will work with your supervisor to decide on a topic and the format of your assignment
- This must be agreed and submitted as agreed
- You cannot undertake primary research
- This must be the equivalent of a 2,500 word essay

#### What to choose:

- Choose a subject that interests you
- It must be health related but can be wider than nursing
- You can look at something outside of your field and you would move into the relevant small group for supervision if necessary

#### What do we mean by format?

- You can choose how to present your work
- It must be the equivalent effort to a 2,500 word essay

#### Previous students have done/considered:

- Writing for publication
- Essay
- Presentation
- Poster
- Literature review
- Case study

## Criteria for success:

#### **Essential Criteria**

- Be supported with relevant references using the approved Harvard format
- Has a <u>reference</u> list of all cited literature (NB. if the reference list is not included the assignment will receive 0% mark)
- Conform to submission instructions as outlined on submission area (if not may receive 0% mark)
- Identification and negotiation and completion of a topic of interest that is of relevance to the overall programme
- Demonstrating of development of the confidence and skills to undertake independent study.
   Desirable Criteria
- Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of issues and concepts
- Content is organised, accurate throughout and shows clear evidence of structure and planning.
- Application of theory to practice is evident across all issues.

- Arguments are clear, logical and well supported.
  Evidence of wide reading which is used to support discussion. Engagement with a range of literature is evident.

## b. Marking rubric

MANCHESTER 1824 The University of Manchester	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors 90 - 100% Exceptional, very advanced	Examples of g practice 'long statement	good form'	phrases to avoided, a	f words and be used, or ccording to g range
<ul> <li>be reasonably expected for the communication. The use of dis understanding that can be expect</li> <li>2. Learning outcomes and assession outcomes and assessment criteric have been adhered to.</li> <li>3. Structure, planning and organ organisation, structure and stand and organ organisation, structure and stand advanced throughout.</li> <li>4. Evidence of reading that is appistudies and / or evidence. Demon material and / or evidence. Demon material and / or examining the limitations of evidence. Advance: employed accurately, consistently contextual evidence, ideas, conception of interpretation, critica findings is very advanced.</li> <li>6. Knowledge and understanding standard of critical analysis. Very a depth understanding, exploration</li> <li>7. Application of theory to practific Application of theory and concepts of link between theory and practic</li> <li>8. Reflection on practice which id decision making. Demonstrates ve work displays very advanced level.</li> <li>9. Arguments: the understanding or standard of theory is advanced in the standard of theory is advanced.</li> </ul>	ment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All lead a have been achieved to an exemplary standard. All requirements of the assess isation: exceptional presentation; clear, logical and creative. Almost flawless dard of presentation of the work including referencing where appropriate are ropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: advanced use of sources strates an impressive command of data or literature drawing on a very broad rar topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates a very advanced sensitivity to the lii d in all respects. Outstanding reference list with academic referencing conver v and according to established practice within the discipline. Use and applicati ots, theory and other relevant information and artefacts is very advanced. <b>liscussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Highly en el evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings; the analysis of res of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: work demonstrates an except dvanced in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. There is a very advanced display	oral and     attains all lear objectives for the adheres to all gui The essential ma presented thoroug accurately and w appropriately. Mc the work am demonstrates advanced knowler an ability to inte theories, eviden theories, eviden thought and the w is expressed is impressive for this work.       tional of in- lards. nding m and s. The     impressive for this work.	ning unit and delines. terial is ghly and eighed oreover, ply very dge and egrate ce and larity of ay that it very	USE Exceptional Very Advanced	AVOID Good Very Good Excellent Perfect Flawless Complete
the assignment to a very advanced	d standard. Levels of rigour, judgement and contextualisation are very advanced. of the ability to challenge the relationship between arguments and concepts. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors 80 - 89% Outstanding, sophisticated, insightful, ambitious, perceptive, advanced, strong		phrases to avoided, a	f words and be used, or ccording to g range	
<ul> <li>communication. The use understanding that can be</li> <li>Learning outcomes and outcomes and outcomes and assessment requirements of the assess</li> <li>Structure, planning and o structure, planning and o structure and standard of j</li> <li>Evidence of reading that command of data or litera demonstrates a high level throughout. Reference list theory and other relevant i</li> <li>Use of research to supp evidence of interpretation critical evaluation and anal</li> <li>Knowledge and understad demonstrates outstanding excellent display of in-dept</li> <li>Application of theory and strong understanding of lite</li> <li>Reflection on practice w decision making. Demonstrates is outstanding outstanding outstanding avery high aspects of the assignment.</li> </ul>	assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning criteria have been adhered to. <b>rganisation</b> : a very high standard of presentation; clear, logical and few errors. The organisation, oresentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, is outstanding throughout. <b>is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded</b> : work demonstrates a very strong ture drawing on a broad range of material and / or examining the topic in some detail. Also of awareness of and sensitivity to the limits of evidence. A very high standard of referencing conforms to a very high standard. Use and application of contextual evidence, ideas, concepts, <b>fromation</b> and artefacts is outstanding. <b>or the discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Outstanding or trite <b>discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Outstanding or tritical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Evidence of interpretation, ysis of research findings is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some. <b>inding of the topic, the main issues and the concepts:</b> an outstanding piece of work which standard of critical analysis that employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. There is an h understanding, exploration and insight and / or research. <b>practice:</b> link between theory and practice enleted issues and / or standards. <b>concepts to practice as proment and responsibility:</b> linitiative, self-reflection and rates outstanding evidence of their ability to reflect on and challenge their assumptions. The work anding levels of decision making and self-reflection. and rates outstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Coherent and articulate arguments, level of understanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Has addressed most or all The work is sophisticated, insightful, ambitious and perceptive. Levels of rigour, judgement and rading. There is very clear evidence throughout of th	Your work is outstanding. Your response to the question is perceptive. Your argument is very well structured. It is logical and convincing. You use data and / or literature to support that argument and give very pertinent examples. You demonstrate a very high level of understanding of this topic. To improve future marks you should attempt to refine your analysis and arguments even further.	USE Outstanding Sophisticated Insightful Ambitious Perceptive Advanced	AVOID Good Very good Excellent Comprehensive	

MANCHESTER 1824 The University of Manchester	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors 70 - 79% Excellent, detailed, lucid, strong in most areas	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements	and phr used, or according	of words uses to be avoided, to marking uge	
<ul> <li>terminology and technik</li> <li>Learning outcomes and assessm requirements of the ass</li> <li>Structure, planning ar of structure and standard</li> <li>Evidence of reading the critical reading which is demonstrates a strong, in some detail. The sub throughout Reference application of a depth a artefacts is excellent.</li> <li>Use of research to su evidence of interpretatile Evidence of interpretatile Evidence of interpretatile.</li> <li>Knowledge and under demonstrates actensive understanding, application of theory Application of theory Application of theory Application of theory and practice-related issis.</li> <li>Reflection making. Excelle ability to reflect on practice decision making and</li> <li>Arguments: the understanding of decision making and</li> <li>Arguments: the understanding of theory and practice on the practice for the presence of the one of the ory application of theory application of a fact and a structure of a structure o</li></ul>	which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and int evidence of ability to reflect on practice, and challenge own assumptions. Excellent evidence of ice which leads to identified personal development. The work consistently displays excellent levels self-reflection. tanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Coherent arguments, demonstrating a high of the topic and associated issues / debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment work is detailed, compelling, lucid and strong in most areas. Levels of rigour, judgement and ion are excellent. There is clear evidence throughout of the ability to challenge the relationship	Your work is excellent. It has clear aims and largely achieves them. It draws upon an appropriately wide range of sources, displays analytical depth with substantial evidence of independent thought, and is written and presented to a very high standard. To improve future marks you should attempt to identify any weaker parts of your argument and / or its presentation, ensure you have addressed opposing viewpoints or evidence decisively, and consider extending the range and use of supporting resources even further.	USE Excellent Detailed Lucid	AVOID Accurate Good Outstanding Authoritative	
MANCHESTER 1824 The University of Manchester	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors 60 - 69% Very good, sound, effective, good in most areas and strong in some	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements	and phi used, o according	es of words rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange	
of written and / or oral accuracy and understam. 2. Learning outcomes an outcomes and assessme achieved to a very good 3. 3. Structure, planning an planning. A very good st structure and standard 4. Evidence of reading wh draws on a good range evidence. Topics are me evidence. A very good st but possibly containing concepts, theory and ott 5. Use of research to sup evidence of interpretail critical evaluation and ar 6. Knowledge and unders understanding of main work contains some verp very good display of und 7. Application of theory	ary good standard of written English with only minor errors present. There is a very good standard communication. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays very good levels of ding. <b>d</b> assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning ent criteria have been achieved to a good standard with some (at the higher ranges of his band) excellent standard. All requirements of the assessment have been adhered to. <b>d</b> organisation: content well organised and accurate and shows clear evidence of structure and andard of presentation; clear, mostly logical and errors are mostly very minor. The organisation of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate are good throughout. <b>tt is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded</b> : clear evidence of appropriate critical ich is used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. The student of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature. Very good use of bastly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of andard of referencing, though a few errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good referencing technical errors, some minor, some more serious. The work shows evidence of interpretation, on, critical evaluation and artefacts. <b>port the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings</b> : very good such analysis of research findings is good in most areas and strong in some. <b>tanding of the topic, the main issues and the concepts</b> : demonstrates knowledge and critical ssues and concepts with clear evidence of understanding, application and problem solving. The good examples of critical analysis but limited in use of ideas, concepts case studies etc. There is a erstanding, insight and / or research. <b>to practice:</b> link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards. to concepts to practice is evident across most issues.	Your work is very good. It addresses the specific topic area very well, with a sound demonstration of knowledge and skills. You provide evidence of appropriate reading and thinking and draw upon the literature coherently to substantiate your claims. Your work is well considered. To improve future marks you should consult a wider range of sources and deepen your analysis.	USE Very good Sound Effective	AVOID Good Excellent Outstanding	

MA	NICLIECTED	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors	Examples of good	Examples of	
MA	NCHESTER 1824	50 - 59%	practice 'long form'	phrases to	
The Uni	iversity of Manchester	Good, clear, fair, competent, reasonable, coherent, good in some areas but only	statements	avoided, ao markin;	-
		satisfactory in others		markin	grange
		ood / reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present. There is f written and / or oral communication though some errors may be present. The use of disciplinary	Your work is good. You	USE	AVOID
		ue displays satisfactory levels of accuracy and understanding.	have demonstrated an	USL	AVOID
		d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning	understanding of the	Good	Very good
		ent criteria have been achieved to a satisfactory standard with some (at the higher ranges of this	relevant principles;	Clear	Evcellent
		d standard. There may be some minor divergences from the specifications of the assessment task. nd organisation: content well organised and accurate and shows evidence of structure and	theories, evidence and techniques and you have	Clear	Excellent
plar	inning. A satisfactory	standard achieved, mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	gone some way to meeting	Fair	Adequate
		ure and standard of presentation of the work are satisfactory, although some instances of poor	your aims through	<b>C</b>	Moderate
		use of referencing conventions may be present. nat is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: some evidence of appropriate	presenting a coherent argument in a competent	Competent	Moderate
		ading, which is used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines.	manner. To improve future	Reasonable	Descriptive
		but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed	marks you should increase	<b>.</b>	
		d in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but d underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulate or understood.	your level of critical appraisal and independent	Coherent	Basic
		the whole, though some inconsistencies of poor / limited citation may be present. Satisfactory	enquiry, and seek to		
		eveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions. The work shows some	demonstrate a deeper		
		the use of ideas, concepts, theory and other relevant information and artefacts. <b>port the discussion:</b> interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Good evidence	understanding of the subject.		
		l evaluation and analysis of research findings. Evidence of interpretation, critical evaluation and	Subject.		
ana	alysis of research find	ings is good in some areas but only satisfactory in others.			
		standing of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: demonstrates knowledge and critical issues and concepts with some evidence of understanding, application and problem solving.			
		I attentive to subject matter and / or task set, but balanced towards a descriptive rather than			
criti	tically analytical argur	nent. There is a good display of in-depth understanding, exploration and insight and / or research.			
		to practice: link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards.			
		nd concept to practice is evident across some issues. Limited discussion of the implications of in some recommendations (where appropriate). Demonstrates a good understanding of link			
bet	tween theory and pra	ctice and practice-related issues and / or standards.			
		which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and			
		nstrates some evidence of ability to reflect on and challenge own assumptions. The work displays mamples of decision making and self-reflection.			
		standing of the topic and associated issues / debates. Arguments are clear, logical and well			
		ne evidence of evaluation and critical analysis. Competent work with evidence of engagement in			
		ittle originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge, may not have the assignment. The work shows some but limited evidence of intellectual rigour, judgement and			
	ntextualisation.				
		FHEQ 5		Example	es of words
MA	NCHESTER	Level descriptors	Examples of good practic	and phi	rases to be
	1824	Level descriptors 40-49%	Examples of good practic 'long form' statements	e and phi used, o	rases to be r avoided,
		Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few		e and phi used, o according	rases to be r avoided, g to marking
The Univ	1824 iversity of Manchester	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others	'long form' statements	e and phi used, o according	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange
The Univ	1824 iversity of Manchester	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient	e and phi used, o according USE	rases to be r avoided, g to marking
The Univ 1. Trai	1824 iversity of Manchester <b>insferable skills:</b> a ucture is poor and wri	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o	e and phi used, o according ra	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u>
The Univ 1. Trai stru and	1824 iversity of Manchester <b>insferable skills:</b> a ucture is poor and wri	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient	e and phi used, o according USE	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange
The Univ 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav	e and phi used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u>
The Univ 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an tcomes and assessme	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The ten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning nt criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack	e and phi used, o according ra <u>USE</u> Sufficient e Adequate	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Univ 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo from	1824 iversity of Manchester unsferable skills: a d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications of	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning	'long form' statements Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav	e and phu used, o according ra <u>USE</u> f Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Univ 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru plar	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications o ucture, planning an ning. Barely satisfac	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Univ 1. Train stru and und 2. Lea outo from 3. Stru plar orga	1824 iversity of Manchester unsferable skills: a ucture is post d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an comes and casessme m the specifications of ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning nt criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The nd standard of presentation of the work are basic.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument	e and phu used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Univ 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru plan orgg 4. Evic	1824 wersity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications of ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure e dence of reading th	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by	e and phu used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Traistru and und 2. Lea outo from 3. Stru plar org; 4. Evic criti rang	1824 iversity of Manchester insferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an comes and assessme m the specifications of ucture, planning an ucture, planning an icomes and assessme m the specifications of ucture, planning an dence of reading which is to icg of sources. Little a	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The ten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written tion. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning nt criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not full address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point	e and phu used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate Basic r s e	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo from 3. Stru plar orgg 4. Evic criti rang in so	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an ccomes and assessme m the specifications of ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure e dence of reading thi cal reading which is is geo fosurces. Little a cophistication or fines	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning nt criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking se. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence /	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data	e and phu used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate Basic r s e	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>Traustru and und</li> <li>Lea outo from</li> <li>Stru plar orga</li> <li>Evic criti rang in sci</li> </ol>	1824 iversity of Manchester aucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfar anisation, structure a dence of reading thi dicar eading which is a isophistication or fines liby in the use of evide	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The ten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning ent criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ses. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing lis	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the	e and phu used, o according ra USE Sufficient e Adequate Basic r s e	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea oute from 3. Stru- plar org; 4. Evic criti rang in st abili poo serial	1824 iversity of Manchester unsferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an comes and assessme m the specifications o ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure e dence of reading which is uge of sources. Little e sophistication or fines lity in the use of evid r, suggesting that lin ious, revealing limite	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking es. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical	e and phu used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Univ 1. Transtru and und 2. Lea outo from 3. Stru plar orga 4. Evic criti rang in ss abili poo seri- rele	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac fanisation, structure a dence of reading th dical reading which is i ophistication or fines lify in the use of evid or, suggesting that ili ious, revealing limite evant information is v	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The ten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun	e and phu used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trais stru and und 2. Lea out fron 3. Stru plar orga 4. Evic critit rang in sc ability poo seri- rele 5. Use	1824 iversity of Manchester insterable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an iccomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac taol reading which is i uge of sources. Little a sophistication or fines a sophistication or fines use of evident billing in the sopart of the soft and to is vece and limit ious, revealing limite evant information is ve e of research to supp	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tien with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking se. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ince. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with dats or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or	e and phi used, o according ra Sufficient Basic Safe s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit stru- and und 2. Lea outco from 3. Stru- plar orga 4. Evico criti rang in so abili poo seria- rele 5. Use / son poo	1824 iversity of Manchester aucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a deare of reading thi deare of reading thi deare of reading which is a sophistication or fines ilipy in the use of evide or, suggesting that ili ious, revealing limite evant information is v e of research to supp orme evidence of inter orly articulated or uno	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The ten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. <b>Sourt the discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Limits of evidence very lerstood; is barely satisfactory in a few a	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun	e and phi used, o according ra Sufficient Basic Safe s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trais stru and und 2. Lea out fron 3. Stru plar orga 4. Evic critit rang in si abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / soo poo 6. Kno 6. Kno 6. Stru 0. Stru	1824 iversity of Manchester unsferable skills: a ucture is poor and wri d / or oral communic. derstanding. arring outcomes an comes and assessme m the specifications c ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th ical reading which is i use of sources. Little a sophistication or fines tig in the use of evid or, suggesting that lin ious, revealing limite evant information is v e of research to supp mere vidence of interno owledge and unders	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate ised to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking see. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. wort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings for widence very derstood; is barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unix 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru- plar org; 4. Evic criti rang in s; abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / soo poo 6. Kno and	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wrid d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure dence of revading a dence of revading a dence of revading a dence of revading to ical reading which is is opplistication or fines livy in the use of evidi or, suggesting that lir ious, revealing limite evant information is v e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or um ownedge and underst d critical understand	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other veak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. bort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and policence weak in most others.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial,	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit stru- and und 2. Lea outco from 3. Stru- plar orga criti rang in sc abili poo seria- rele 5. Use / soo poo 6. Kno and prof	1824 iversity of Manchester austruter is poor and wrid d / or oral communica derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac fanisation, structure a ucture, planning an anning arely satisfac fanisation, structure a isophistication or fines ility in the use of evide or, suggesting that in ious, revealing limite evant information is v e of research to supp or evidence of inter orly articlated or run oveledge and unders d critical understand ibblem solving. Narroo	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate ised to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking see. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. wort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings for widence very derstood; is barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others.	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unix 1. Trai stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru- plar org; 4. Evic criti rang in s; abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / soo poo 6. Kno and prov 7. App	1824 iversity of Manchester ansferable skills: a ucture is poor and wrid d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure dence of reading the dence of reading the dence of reading the dence of reading the dence of reading the ical reading which is is ophistication or fines livy in the use of evide or, suggesting that lir ious, revealing limite evant information is w e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or um owledge and unders d critical understandi bblem solving. Narroo wided in lectures / se plication of theory	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other veak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. bort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Limits of evidence very ferstood; is barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others. standing of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: demonstrates sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and v range of data and / or literature employed is very limited. May be mostly limite	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit stru- and und 2. Lea outco fron 3. Stru- plar orga criti rang in ss abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / son proo 6. Kno and prol pro 7. App Lim	1824 versity of Manchester austeries poor and wri- d / or oral communica- derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th tical reading which is s uge of sources. Little a sophistication or fines lity in the use of evid for, sug, seveling thal litite evant information is v e of research to supp or evidence of inter or directical understand a cirtical understand ablem solving. Narroo vvided in lectures / se plication of theory ited application of the	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use: Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other veak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. For tation, critical evaluation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and v range of data and / or literature employed is very limit	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trais stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru plar orgg 4. Evic critit rang in si abilit poo seri- rele 5. Use / soi poo 6. Kno and pron 7. App Limit org 0. Lea org 0. Evic critit poo 0. Stru poo 0. Stru poo 1. Stru 1. Stru 1	1824 iversity of Manchester austeries poor and wri- d / or oral communic. derstanding. arrning outcomes and arcomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfar anisation, structure e dence of reading thi ical reading which is a igge of sources. Little a donce of reading thi ical reading which is a igge of sources. Little a sophistication or file as ophistication or file as of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articular dorerstand oblem solving. Narroo wided in lectures / see plication of theory nited application of the analysis which resuli	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The then with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate ised to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ise. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing lis nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. Wort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and vrange of data and / or literature employed is very limited. May be mostly limited to material minars. There is a limited evidence of understanding, ex	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>The Unit</li> <li>Traisstrumand</li> <li>Lea outco fron</li> <li>Strumplar</li> <li>Outco fron</li> <li>Strumplar</li> <li>Strumplar</li> <li>Criting ability</li> <li>Criting and series</li> <li>Songood</li> <li>Knog and prologood</li> <li>Knog and prologood</li> <li>App Limmon of a theorem</li> <li>Refif</li> </ol>	1824 versity of Manchester austerure is poor and wri d / or oral communica derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac fanisation, structure a dence of reading th dical reading this is applistication or fines ility in the use of evide or, suggesting that in ious, revealing limite evant information is v e of research to supp or evidence of inter orly articlated or run oveledge and unders of critical understand biblem solving. Narroo vided in lectures / se plication of theory ited application of th analysis which result fory and practice and flection on practice	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. <b>Sort tediscussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and v range of data and / or iterature employed is very limited. May be mostly limited to material minars. There is a limited evidence of understanding, exploration and insight and / or research. <b>to practice:</b> link between theory and practice and practi	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
The Unit 1. Trais stru and und 2. Lea outo fron 3. Stru plar orgg 4. Evic criti rang in sc abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / soi poo 6. Kno and prof prof 2. Lea outo seri- rang in sc abili poo seri- rele 5. Use / soi poo 6. Kno and prof 8. Refn dec 8. Refn dec 8. Refn dec 1. Lea 1. Lea 1. Stru poo seri- rele 1. Stru poo seri- rele 1. Stru poo seri- rele 1. Stru poo seri- rele 1. Stru poo seri- rele 5. Use 8. Refn dec 8. Refn dec 1. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 6. Kno 8. Refn dec 8. Refn dec 1. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru poo 5. Stru seri- seri- seri- seri- seri- seri- seri- Stru 5. Stru 5. Stru 5	1824 iversity of Manchester auture is poor and wri d / or oral communic. derstanding. arrning outcomes and accomes and assessme m the specifications c ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfar anisation, structure a dence of reading thi ical reading which is i ge of sources. Little a donce of reading thi ical reading which is i ge of sources. Little a sophistication or fines lify in the use of evid- or, suggesting that lin ious, revealing limite want information is v e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or und oveldege and understand blem solving. Narroo wided in lectures / se plication of theory nited application of th analysis which result ory and practice and lection and practice ision making. Demor	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The then with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate ised to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited trem to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ise. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing lis inted effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. <b>Nort the discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and vrange of data and / or literature employed is very limited. May be mosty limited to material minars. There is a limited evidence of understanding, ex	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>The Unit</li> <li>Traistruant</li> <li>A train and und</li> <li>Lea outco fron</li> <li>Struppiar</li> <li>Struppiar</li> <li>Traistruppiar</li> <li>Struppiar</li> <li>Struppiar</li> <li>Testingiar</li> <li>Testingiar</li></ol>	1824 iversity of Manchester austerity of Manchester ducture is poor and wrid d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th tical reading which is is ophistication or fines lity in the use of evidia or, suggesting that lir ious, revealing limite evant information is w e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or ung d critical understand bolem solving. Narroo d critical understand bolem solving. Narroo plication of theory nited application of theory nited application of theory nited application of theory inted application of theory licet application of theory ory and practice and flection on practice cision making. Demory limited examples of	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking use. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other veak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. bort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Limits of evidence very lerstood; is barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others. standing of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: demonstrates	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>The Unit</li> <li>Traisstrumand</li> <li>traisstrumand</li> <li>Lea aouto</li> <li>fron</li> <li>Strumplar</li> <li>orga</li> <li>evid</li> <li>criti</li> <li>rangins</li> <li>strumand</li> <li>trains</li> <li>trans</li></ol>	1824 versity of Manchester autorre is poor and wrid d / or oral communica derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th tical reading which is u ige of sources. Little a cophistication or fines lity in the use of evid for, suggeveng that in icon evidence of evid ro, suggeveng that in icon evidence of inter ority articular do and one evidence of inter ority articular do finter ovel dege and unders oveldege and unders di critical understand dibelm solving. Narroo vivided on lectures / se plication of thanalysis which result iony and practice and flection on practice ission making. Demon y limited examples of yuments: the unders	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The then with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate ised to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited trem to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ise. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / nece. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing lis inted effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. <b>Nort the discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and vrange of data and / or literature employed is very limited. May be mosty limited to material minars. There is a limited evidence of understanding, ex	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>The Unit</li> <li>Traistruant</li> <li>traistruant</li> <li>Lea outco</li> <li>fron</li> <li>Strup</li> <li>plar</li> <li>orgg</li> <li>Evic crititic</li> <li>rangin si</li> <li>abilitic crititic</li> <li>rele</li> <li>Use</li> <li>/ soit</li> <li>rele</li> <li>Use</li> <li>/ soit</li> <li>poo</li> <li>Kno</li> <li>and</li> <li>prov</li> <li>Apple</li> <li>Limitic of a the</li> <li>decivery</li> <li>Arg</li> <li>and</li> <li>und</li> </ol>	1824 iversity of Manchester austeries poor and wrid d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th tical reading which is a cophistication or fines lity in the use of evidi or, suggesting that lir ious, revealing limite evant information is w e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or un owledge and unders d critical understand oblem solving. Narrow pilcation of theory nited application of theory nited application of theory ited application of theory ited application of theory isory and practice and flection on practice cision making. Demon y limited examples of yuments: the unders	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The tten with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a baic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited ttempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ses. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing is nited effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other veak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. bort the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Lifficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient, partial prietation got tha topic, the main issues and the concepts: demonstrates sufficient knowledge mg of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and v range of data and / or literature employed is very limite	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak
<ol> <li>The Unit</li> <li>Traisstrumant</li> <li>traistrumant</li> <li>Lea and und</li> <li>Lea and und</li> <li>Lea and and and and and and and and and an</li></ol>	1824 iversity of Manchester austeries poor and wrid d / or oral communic derstanding. arning outcomes an accomes and assessme m the specifications or ucture, planning an nning. Barely satisfac anisation, structure a dence of reading th tical reading which is a cophistication or fines lity in the use of evidi or, suggesting that lir ious, revealing limite evant information is w e of research to supp me evidence of inter orly articulated or un owledge and unders d critical understand oblem solving. Narrow pilcation of theory nited application of theory nited application of theory ited application of theory ited application of theory isory and practice and flection on practice cision making. Demon y limited examples of yuments: the unders	Level descriptors 40-49% Sufficient, adequate, partial / some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others barely satisfactory standard of written English. A number of serious errors are present. The then with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. There is a basic but poor standard of written ation. The use of disciplinary terminology and technique displays minimal levels of accuracy and d assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. All learning int criteria have been met but only to the required minimal level. There may be some divergences of the assessment task. d organisation: content is mostly well organised, accurate and shows evidence of structure and tory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies / errors may be of a more serious nature. The ind standard of presentation of the work are basic. at is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: limited evidence of appropriate used to support discussion and integration of theories from related disciplines. Draws on a limited tempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Lacking ise. Submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulate or understood. Citations present but referencing lis inted effort has been made to follow guidance. References barely adequate. Many errors, some d awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Students' grasp of ideas, concepts, theories and other weak and is poorly articulated or contains flaws. <b>Fort the discussion</b> : interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Sufficient, partial pretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research findings. Sufficient knowledge ng of main issues and concepts, but with limited evidence of understanding, application and varage of data and / or literature employed is very limited. May be mosty limited May be mosty limited to material minars. There is a limited evidenc	Your work has sufficient knowledge, coherence, use o appropriate resources and quality of presentation to warrant a basic pass. You hav provided an answer that lack detail and depth. It is very descriptive and does not fully address the issues raised by the question. Your argument are often simplistic. To achiev a higher mark you need to make sure that all your point are fully supported with data or evidence from the literature. You also need to achieve greater analytical depth and take fuller accoun of opposing viewpoints or evidence in order to provide more substantial, comprehensive and nuanced	e and phi used, o according f Sufficient e Adequate Basic s s s t	rases to be r avoided, g to marking ange <u>AVOID</u> Weak

MANCHESTER 1824		Level descriptors (Degree) FAIL 30 - 39%	Examples of good practice 'long form'	Examples of words an phrases to be used, of avoided, according to	
'he U	Iniversity of Manchester	Insufficient, partial, some awareness, barely satisfactory in a few areas and weak in most others	statements		ng range
cl / si	larity of meaning. Tex paragraph composit ignificant flaws in spe	satisfactory standard of written English. Too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine t occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence ion. There is an unsatisfactory standard of written and / or oral communication; there may be elling, grammar and composition which undermine the clarity of meaning. The use of disciplinary iques does not meet required levels of accuracy and understanding.	Your work demonstrates insufficient and partial knowledge and skills in the topic and does not merit a	<u>USE</u> Insufficient	<b>AVOID</b> Wrong
. L	earning outcomes a	ndus soles not meet required revels of accuracy and understanding. nd assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. One or more of and assessment criteria have not been met. Pays insufficient attention to the assessment criteria	pass mark. Your work does not demonstrate adequately	Partial	Rubbis
a . S	nd significantly diverg tructure, planning a	ges from the specifications of the assessment task. <b>Ind organisation:</b> no / insufficient structure or evidence of planning / illegible presentation. Poor / d, lacking sufficient clarity and a logical progression with serious errors / inaccuracies. The work is	the study skills required at this level. Although you show some awareness of the	Some awareness	Weak Poor
d o e fi cl s	lisorganised and uncl vidence of reading t r inappropriate. Refer vidence. Examples ar nesse. Submission re hoice and use of evid oorly structured. GL cholarship. The work	ear, and the standard including references where appropriate is weak. hat is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: evidence of reading is insufficient rence list absent / inappropriate. Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess e occasionally provided, but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or flects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence / ability in the ence. Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is omitted, partial or idance not followed. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of draws on a very limited range of contextual evidence, theory, literature and other artefacts. There f wider reading and very limited evidence of the mechanics of scholarship.	area, you have missed many important facts and concepts and made major errors. You have made no attempt to critically evaluate evidence and shown no evidence of independent research. Your work has minimal underlying structure and is frequently		
e a	Jse of research to s vidence of interpreta nalytical engagement	upport the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Insufficient tion, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research. Insufficient evidence of a critical or	confused and incoherent. To improve future marks you should improve your awareness of the		
ki rr a	nowledge and under neet expected levels o	standing of the topic / concepts / issues. The treatment is mostly descriptive. The work does not of understanding and exploration of major ideas. Whilst the work contains some evidence of critical ed or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass. It contains some material of merit but shows very	appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques and engage more critically with them. You		
A n	ot demonstrate or h	to practice: link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards. Does as insufficient demonstration of how theory is linked to practice. Understanding of link between id practice-related issues and / or standards is insufficient for a pass. The work does not make any	should present and structure your arguments better and make sure that they are		
	eal attempts to asses	s or apply the evidence or theory. Examples are occasionally provided but poorly articulated.	substantiated.		
re . R d n	eflection on practic lecision making. Insu o substantive eviden	s or apply the evidence or theory. Examples are occasionally provided but poorly articulated. se which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and fficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated the of decision making and self-reflection.	substantiated.		
re d n . A o th a	teflection on practic lecision making. Insui o substantive eviden- urguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoor he question that fail rguments. Poor unde	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated e of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address s to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and	substantiated.		
re d n 0. A o th a	teflection on practic lecision making. Insui o substantive eviden- urguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoor he question that fail rguments. Poor unde	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated e of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research.	substantiated.	Example	es of wor
re d n A o th a e	teflection on practic lecision making. Insui o substantive eviden- urguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoor he question that fail rguments. Poor unde	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated ce of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address is to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors	Examples of good practice 'long form'		and
re d n . A o th a e : M	teflection on practic decision making. Insu: o substantive eviden rguments: the unde pinions are unsuppor he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major in ANCHESTER	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated co f decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29%	Examples of good	phrases t avoided,	and o be used accordin
R d n . A o th a e: M	terflection on practice decision making. Insur os substantive eviden urguments: the undee pinions are unsuppoo he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major ic ANCHESTER 1824 Iniversity of Mancheste	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated co d decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements	phrases t avoided, marki	and o be usec according ing range
re R d n A o th a e M M M	teflection on practic decision making. Insu: or substantive eviden rrguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoo he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major ic ANCHESTER 1824 Juiversity of Mancheste ransferable skills: a aragraph compositio	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated ce of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address is to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence /	Examples of good practice 'long form'	phrases t avoided,	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u> I
re R d n A o th a e M M T P L C S	teflection on practic decision making. Insu: or substantive eviden urguments: the under pinions are unsuppoo he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major ic ANCHESTER 1824 Juiversity of Mancheste ransferable skills: a laragraph compositio earning outcomes a confused and weak in tructure, planning	te which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated ce of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address is to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and teas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. ind assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Some attempt. and organisation: confused and weak in most areas. No / insufficient structure or evidence of	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It demonstrates only a basic	phrases t avoided, marki <u>USE</u> Inadequate	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u>
re d n A o th a e M M T P L C S s	teflection on practice decision making. Insu or substantive eviden irguments: the under pinions are unsuppor he question that fail rguments. Poor under xploration of major in ANCHESTER IS24 Juniversity of Manchester instruction of major in Anchester instruction of major in Anchester instruction of major in Anchester instruction of major in Anchester instruction of major in antipote in the anchester in tructure of and weak in tructure, planning antificiently logical provi-	te which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and fficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated es of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. md assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Some attempt.	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It	phrases t avoided, marki <u>USE</u> Inadequate	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u> Wror Rubb
re R d n A o th a e M M T P L C S P S I R n a a n n n A	teflection on practice decision making. Insur- or substantive eviden- inguments: the unde- pinions are unsuppoo- he question that fail rguments. Poor unde- xploration of major in ANCHESTER IS24 Junversity of Manchester ransferable skills: a aragraph composition earning outcomes a confused and weak in trunting / ilegicla pro- vidercence of readinger fueference is asily accessi re, being very poorly limost or entirely ab acchanics of scholars	te which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and fficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated es of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. ind assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Some attempt. most areas. Most or all of the learning outcomes and assessment criteria have not been met. and organisation: confused and weak in most areas. No / insufficient structure or evidence of a sentation. Very poor and unsatisfactory standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity and a gression with many serious inaccuracies. that is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: is insufficient or inappropriate. Inappropriate, Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture leweb sources. No attempt made to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided, those that employed. Work reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level. Citations sent. Guidance largely ignored. Reference list omitted very poorly assembled. Awareness of hip very weak.	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It demonstrates only a basic awareness of the subject matter. Your awareness of principles, theories, evidence and techniques is insufficient, and you show little evidence of critical engagement with the material. You have not paid sufficient attention to the	phrases t avoided, marki USE Inadequate Deficient Some attempt	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u> Wror Rubb Wea
R d n A o tha ei M T PLCS PSIER n a a m U d ei K	terflection on practice decision making. Insu os substantive eviden trguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoor he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major le ANCHESTER 1824 ANCHESTER 1824 arargaraph compositio earning outcomes a onfused and weak in arargaraph compositio earning outcomes a onfused and weak in anning / illegible pro ufficiently logical proj vidence of reading tererence list absent / totes or easily accessil rechanics of scholars se of research to s leficient, confused, lik vidence of a critical o inowledge and under	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and ficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated is of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempts to address to an asver the question fully in a robust manner. Mosty unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas. Poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. and assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Some attempt. most areas. Nost or all of the learning outcomes and assessment criteria have not been met. and organisation: confused and weak in most areas. No / insufficient structure or evidence of assentation. Very poor and unsatisfactory standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity and a gression with many serious inaccuracies. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture be web sources. No attempt made to assess evidence. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture be web sources. No attempt made to assess evidence. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture is employed. Work reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level. Citations sent. Guidance largely ignored. Reference list omitted very poorly assembled. Awareness of hip very weak. upport the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Inadequate, the evidence of interpretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research. Contains little ranalytica	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It demonstrates only a basic awareness of the subject matter. Your awareness of principles, theories, evidence and techniques is insufficient, and you show little evidence of critical engagement with the material. You have not paid	phrases t avoided, marki USE Inadequate Deficient Some attempt	and o be used accordin ing range AVO Wror Rubbi Wea
T PLCS PSER na air Ude Kleili	teflection on practice decision making. Insur os substantive eviden urguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoo he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major in ANCHESTER 1824 Iniversity of Mancheste arangraph composition arangraph composition arangraph composition anning / ilegibea pro- vidence of reading re, being very poorly u lefficiently logical pro- vidence of reading re, being very poorly u lenost or entriely ab most or entriely ab selficient, confused, litd vidence of a critical o inovelofka on analy	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and fficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated is of decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to an sover the question fully in a robust manner. Mostly unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. mot assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Some attempt. most areas. Most or all of the learning outcomes and assessment criteria have not been met. and organisation: confused and weak in most areas. No / insufficient structure or evidence of gresentation. Very poor and unsatisfactory standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity and a gression with many serious inaccuracies. that is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: is insufficient or inappropriate inappropriate. Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture ole web sources. No attempt made to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided, those that employed. Work reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level. Citations sent. Guidance largely ignored. Reference list omitted very poorly assembled. Awareness of hip very weak. upport the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research. Contains little ranalytical engagement in the topic. rstanding of the topic, concepts / issues.	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It demonstrates only a basic awareness of the subject matter. Your awareness of principles, theories, evidence and techniques is insufficient, and you show little evidence of critical engagement with the material. You have not paid sufficient attention to the quality, range and appropriateness of sources used, and your arguments are partial and unsubstantiated. To improve future marks you should improve your	phrases t avoided, marki USE Inadequate Deficient Some attempt	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u> Wror
T PLCS PSER naiainUdeKleiii	terflection on practice decision making. Insu os substantive eviden urguments: the unde pinions are unsuppoo he question that fail rguments. Poor unde xploration of major in ANCHESTER 1824 Iniversity of Mancheste arangraph compositio earning outcomes a confused and weak in tructure, planning / illegible pro ufficiently logical pro vidence of reading deference list absent / tootes or easily accessil re, being very poorly vidence of reading efficient, confused, litt vidence of a critical o movel of general entry absent vidence of a critical o nevel of a critical o aveloge and uge and the evidence of a analy pplication of theory ot demonstrate or h heory and practice an	e which identifies professional development and responsibility: initiative, self-reflection and fficient evidence of safe practice. Insufficient ability to reflect on practice. The work demonstrated co decision making and self-reflection. rstanding of the topic and associated issues / debates. Illogical arguments are presented. Personal ted. The submission contains some minor material of merit but it is only a partial attempt to address to answer the question fully in a robust manner. Mosty unsuccessful attempts to construct rstanding of key issues or concepts. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding and leas. It contains some material of minor merit but shows very limited insight and / or research. FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 20 - 29% Inadequate, deficient, some attempt but confused and weak in most areas poor standard of written English. Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar and basic sentence / n. and organisation: confused and weak in most areas. No / insufficient structure or evidence of esentation. Very poor and unsatisfactory standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity and a gression with many serious inaccuracies. that is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: is insufficient or inappropriate. Inappropriate. Iraws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture be web sources. No A its provided to a gression: interpretation and application of relevant research (dust reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level. Citations sent. Guidance largely ignored. Reference list omitted very poory assembled. Awareness of hip very weak. upport the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Inadequate, is evidence of interpretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate research. Contains little ranalytical engagement in the topic. restanding of the topic / concepts / issues. The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains and application of relevant research f	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements Your work is inadequate, deficient, confused and weak in most areas of the topic and does not merit a pass mark. It demonstrates only a basic awareness of the subject matter. Your awareness of principles, theories, evidence and techniques is insufficient, and you show little evidence of critical engagement with the material. You have not paid sufficient attention to the quality, range and appropriateness of sources used, and your arguments are partial and unsubstantiated. To improve future marks you	phrases t avoided, marki USE Inadequate Deficient Some attempt	and o be used accordin ing range <u>AVO</u> Wror Rubb Wea

MANCHESTER 1824 The University of Manchester	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 10 - 19% Severely inadequate, very deficient, incomplete and very weak in most areas	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements	phrases to avoided, a	of words and be used, or according to ng range	
<ul> <li>sentences or paragrap</li> <li>Learning outcomes and learning outcomes and</li> <li>Structure, planning a evidence that any thou</li> <li>Evidence of reading Reference list absent / engagement in study i merit description as su</li> <li>Use of research to suj inadequate or inappro is incomplete and very</li> <li>Knowledge and unde level of knowledge rowledge of knowledge</li> <li>Application of theory not demonstrate or h theory and practice is su</li> <li>Reflection on practic decision making. Insuf</li> <li>Arguments: the undet opinions are unsuppor</li> </ul>	nd assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. Nearly all of the d assessment criteria have not been met. and organisation: no / insufficient structure or evidence of planning / illegible presentation. Little ught has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors / inaccuracies. that is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: insufficient or inappropriate. / inappropriate, Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of on a more general level. Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No reference list that could uch. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship. poprt the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Absent, severely priate inclusion of research findings. Evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of research findings (weak in most areas. No evidence of analytical engagement in the topic. erstanding of the topic / concepts / issues. The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Little a und critical understanding of the topic. / to practice: link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards. Does as insufficient demonstration of how theory is linked to practice. Understanding of link between	Your work is severely inadequate, very deficient, incomplete and very weak in most areas of the topic and unfortunately does not merit a pass mark. You show little or confused awareness of the appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques and little evidence of critical engagement. Your arguments are poorly presented and misrepresent or fail to demonstrate an understanding of the subject. Your use of sources is inappropriate and your arguments are unsubstantiated and unstructured. To improve future marks you should improve your awareness of the appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques and engage more critically with them. You should present and structure your arguments better and make sure that they are substantiated.	USE Severely inadequate Very deficient Incomplete	AVOID Wrong Rubbish Weak Poor	
MANCHESTER 1824 The University of Manchester	FHEQ 5 Level descriptors FAIL 0 - 9% Profoundly inadequate, highly deficient and very weak in all areas	Examples of good practice 'long form' statements	phrases to avoided, a	f words and be used, or ccording to og range	
attempt to compose p 2. Learning outcomes a learning outcomes an 3. Structure, planning evidence that any thoi 4. Evidence of reading evidence. Reference l engagement in study d 5. Use of research to s inappropriate inclusio weak in all areas. Prof research findings. No 6. Knowledge and under and exploration of theory not demonstrate or ha theory and practice ar 8. Reflection on practice decision making. Insul 9. Arguments: the under	tandard of English and communication, and use of disciplinary terminology. Incomprehensible. No roper sentences or paragraphs. and assessment criteria: adherence to the criteria for assessment in the question. None of the d assessment criteria has been met. and organisation: no / insufficient structure or evidence of planning / illegible presentation. No ught has been given to the standard of presentation. that is appropriate, relevant, broad and accurately recorded: insufficient or inappropriate list absent / inappropriate. Citations entirely absent. Submission reflects a very limited level of on a more general level. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent. support the discussion: interpretation and application of relevant research findings. Absent or no f research findings. Critical evaluation and analysis of research findings is highly deficient; interpretation, critical evaluation and analysis of appropriate standing of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: presents entirely inadequate standing of the topic, the main issues and the concepts: presents entirely inadequate standing of the topic the oncepts / issues. The work does not meet expected levels of understanding jor ideas. It is profoundly inadequate and lacking in depth to justify a pass. / to practice: link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards. Does a insufficient demonstration of how theory is linked to practice. No understanding of link between the ory standards.	Your work is profoundly inadequate, highly deficient and very weak in all areas of the topic and unfortunately does not merit a pass mark. You have misrepresented or misunderstood thinking in the discipline and your use of sources is either non-existent or inappropriate. You have not demonstrated any significant awareness of the subject matter. Your work is confused and incoherent and does not address the question posed. To improve future marks you should seek to understand thinking in the discipline and engage critically with it. You should present and structure your arguments better and make sure that they are substantiated.	USE Profoundly inadequate Highly deficient	AVOID Wrong Rubbish Weak Poor	

## c. Teaching materials:

<u>https://livemanchesterac.sharepoint.com/:p:/s/UOM-SCO-</u> <u>OptionalityinAssessment/Ec4YZkLdltFDkoMH3LtDXd0B\_dGodviXp4h7Cq5xxu1kFA?e=OlgdM</u> <u>S</u>

#### d. Other links or pertinent information

The Negotiated Study is an option unit in Year 2 of the BNurs (pre registration nursing degree). It allows the students to explore a subject that is related to nursing but does not have to be nursing per se. The students choose their subject and it is agreed with their field specific supervisor. They then discuss and decide on how

they want to be assessed. Students can choose any format in which to submit their assignment but it must be agreed with the supervisor. To date, students have chosen the following: traditional essay, article for publication, literature review, power point presentation, poster. The only restriction is that they cannot undertake a piece of primary research. Students find the unit challenging but rewarding because of the flexibility given.